

(*Proceedings of the Physiographic Society*). This volume (the only one to appear) was actually published in four sections (comprising pp. 1–64, 65–132, 133–220 and 221–318 respectively) over a period of ten years (Dal 1996), but only the first section bears a date (1776), which has until now been considered the date of publication of *Lagopus mutus*.

Montin's paper comprises pp. 150–155 and was therefore part of the third section, something which is obvious from the paper itself since the pages are marked "Del I. St. 3" (Part I Section 3). The date of publication of this section can be determined from the minutes of the Physiographic Society. At the meeting on 2 May 1781 the Secretary announced that "nu 3:dje stycket af Handlingarne på Herr Assessor Gjörwells förlag war färdigt tryckt" ("the printing of the third section of the Proceedings at Mr Gjörwell's Press is now finished"), while at the next meeting on 3 October: "Secreteraren upwiste tredje stycket af Sällskapets handlingar, hwilket war från Stockholm nedkommit, sedan sista sammankomst" ("The Secretary displayed the third section of the Society's Proceedings which had arrived from Stockholm since the previous meeting") (cited after Gertz (1940, pp. 15–16)). The date of publication is confirmed by a review in *Upfostrings-Sällskapets Tidningar* (no. 32 p. 125 (26 April 1781)). That the Proceedings could be reviewed in Stockholm on 26 April, but had not yet arrived in Lund (where the Physiographic Society was situated) on 2 May is not surprising considering the distance (c. 600 km) and the slowness of communications during the eighteenth century.

From these data it is clear that the date of publication for *Lagopus mutus* is actually 1781, and that the name should therefore be cited as *Lagopus mutus* (Montin, 1781).

References:

- Dal, B. 1996. *Sveriges zoologiska litteratur. En berättande översikt om svenska zoologer och deras tryckta verk 1483–1920*. Orbis Pictus, Kjøge.
 Gertz, O. 1940. *Kungl. Fysiografiska Sällskapet i Lund 1772–1940. Historisk överblick och Personförteckningar*. Håkan Ohlssons Boktryckeri, Lund.
 Montin, L. 1781. Tvänne Arter af Snöripan. *Physiographiska Sällskapets Handlingar* Del 1 St. 3: 150–155.

Address: Kimstadsvägen 37, S-610 20 Kimstad, Sweden.

Wattled Cranes in Guinea-Bissau

by N. J. Collar

Received 30 April 1997

Remarks by Hazevoet (*Bull. Brit. Orn. Cl.* 117: 56–59) concerning the handling in Collar & Stuart (1985, *Threatened Birds of Africa*) of a record of Wattled Crane *Bugeranus carunculatus* from Guinea-Bissau strike me as over-critical. As far as Collar & Stuart (1985) are

concerned, this record did not require his reinstatement: if we are guilty of "less than adequate" interpretation, so is he, for his assertion that we "cast doubt on the validity of the record" is unfounded. We wrote: "A specimen, considered immature, was collected in 1948 at Lake Cufada, Fulacunda, in Guinea-Bissau", and went on exactly as quoted in Hazevoet's first paragraph, concluding by citing Snow's (1978) judgement that "it seems certain that the birds involved were either escapes or vagrants".

In no way, then, was this record doubted, and I cannot see why Hazevoet includes either Snow (1978) or Collar & Stuart (1985) amongst the unconvinced, or why he lumps Snow (1978) and Dowsett (1993) with Collar & Stuart (1985) in accusing them of failing to understand Frade & Bacelar's Portuguese, which is a remark only really dirigible at me (I drafted the account in Collar & Stuart), and one which I reject. What is true is that my comment concerning "an incomplete reference that suggests the species had previously been recorded at this locality" was made without checking the bibliography in Frade & Bacelar (1955). In accumulating many references on the Wattled Crane for the account in *Threatened Birds of Africa* I had, under considerable time pressure, merely taken a copy of the pages dealing with the crane in their paper, and therefore did not refer to any of its sources.

On re-reading these pages, however, I see that one particularly bald statement in Frade & Bacelar, also quoted by Hazevoet ("J. A. Ferreira, in his article on the 'Fauna of the Cufada Reserve', mentions the species under the designation '*grous de carúncula*'"), is clearly the source of my mistaken remark, as it can easily be misinterpreted (without mistranslation) as (a) suggesting that this work is not in the bibliography (otherwise the authors might just have written "Ferreira [1948], in his . . ."), hence my view of its citation as incomplete; and (b) implying that the species might well have been found in the reserve on several occasions (otherwise it is not clear why Frade & Bacelar, having already given the record Hazevoet is discussing, should have troubled to make this extra citation at all). Moreover, since only seven lines earlier they refer to "Major Araújo Ferreira" as supplying the specimen evidence, and on the next page credit him (albeit there as *Captain* Araújo Ferreira) for the photographs, it is not even obvious that their author "J. A. Ferreira" (a common enough name in Portuguese, almost *Smith* in English!) is the same person, which compounds the illusion of multiple records.

All this emphasises the importance of remaining alert to potential alternative readings of the literature, and of the value of tracing every reference for original rather than second-hand evidence. However, even Hazevoet may concede that the pursuit of a source as obscure as *Bol. Cult. Guiné Port.* (1948) in order to seek further details of evidence *already accepted as valid* may not represent optimal use of deadlined time in documenting a species with 110 other references to process, and with 176 other species jostling for treatment.

Neotype of the Hooded Plover *Charadrius rubricollis* Gmelin, 1789

by Ian A. W. McAllan & Leslie Christidis

Received 17 June 1997

Examination of the Australian bird literature reveals the continued use of two different species-group names for the Hooded Plover: *Charadrius rubricollis* Gmelin, 1789 and *Charadrius cucullatus* Vieillot, 1818. Since the publication of the 1975 edition of the Australian Checklist (Condon 1975), most references in the Australian literature have adopted *rubricollis* (note that Condon also used the name in 1968). In the previous 75 years the name *cucullatus* was widely used in the Australian literature. Condon based his decision on what he stated was Oberholser's "rejection" of Vieillot's name in 1919. This is, however, not strictly true. Oberholser did not reject *cucullatus*; he resurrected *rubricollis* instead.

Oberholser's resurrection of *rubricollis* derives from Mathews' discussion on the background of the name. Mathews (1913) showed that Gmelin's description of *rubricollis* was simply a Latin translation of a description of a bird (in English) by Latham in volume III of his *General Synopsis of Birds*. This bird, called by Latham the "Red-necked Plover" was "Found in Adventure Bay, Van Diemen's Land" and was evidently based on drawings of birds delineated on Captain Cook's third voyage by the artist William Ellis (drawings now held in The Natural History Museum, London). One of these, number 67, is clearly that of a Hooded Plover (see for example Whitley 1970, wherein there is a monochrome photograph of this drawing). Latham's description also recorded that the Red-necked Plover had "on each side of the neck a large square chestnut spot, the size of a silver penny," and "a little mixture of white around the bastard wing", characters not found in the Hooded Plover, nor in Ellis' drawing 67. Mathews determined that Latham's bird was also based in part on Ellis' drawing number 63, a picture of a Red-necked Phalarope *Phalaropus lobatus* (Linnaeus, 1758), which had the relevant features. On the basis of Latham's description and the evidence of the drawings, Mathews considered that the name *rubricollis* was not valid because it was based on two different species.

Oberholser's decision to resurrect the name involves the incorrect argument that Latham's description was based primarily on the Hooded Plover. However as the name *rubicollis* refers to more than one taxon it would appear to be a case of instant homonymy and is thus not valid.

Today the species-group name *rubicollis* is applied almost universally to the Hooded Plover. It has been used in many widely read publications such as Peters (1934), Condon (1975), Marchant *et al.* (1986), Sibley & Monroe (1990), Marchant & Higgins (1993) Collar *et al.* (1994) and Christidis & Boles (1994). However, the name